

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of December 22, 2008.

Claims 16-21 and 29-30 are pending in the present application. Claims 16-21 and 29-30 have been rejected. Claim 16 and 30 has been amended to further define the scope and novelty of the present invention, to address a claim objection and 35 U.S.C. §102 rejections, in view of the Examiner's comments, in order to place the claims in condition for allowance. Support for the amendments to the claims is found on page 20, lines 1-16, and page 21, lines 11-20. New claims 31 and 32 have been added. Note that new claims 31 and 32 correspond to previously cancelled claims 1 and 7, respectively. New claims 31 and 32 are similar in scope to amended independent claim 16. As such, support for claims 31 and 32 is found in original claims 1 and 7 as well as on page 20, lines 1-16, and page 21, lines 11-20. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been presented. Accordingly, claims 16-21 and 29-32 are pending. For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are allowable. Consequently, reconsideration, allowance, and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the phone interview of March 12, 2009. The 35 U.S.C. §101 and §102 rejections and possible amendments for overcoming the rejections were discussed. We appreciate the courtesy and helpfulness of the Examiner in the interview. The claims have been amended in light of the points made by the Examiner in the interview.

Claim Objections

Examiner Stated:

Claim 19 is objected to because the amended portion should read “indicates one of” rather than “indicates *on* of.”

Appropriate correction is requested.

In response, claim 19 has been amended to change “indicates on of” to read “indicates one of.” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19, as amended, now overcomes the objection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Examiner Stated:

Claim 16 and dependent claims thereto are rejected under section 101 as reciting improper claim methods...

In response, claim 16 has been amended to address the above-referenced rejection. Specifically, claim 16 has been amended to include the phrase “the method being performed by a computer.” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16, as amended, now complies with 35 U.S.C. §101.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Examiner Stated:

Claims 10-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being taught by Hand et al. (U.S. Patent 7,032,071)....

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejections. Embodiments of the present invention provides a user-friendly interactive system and method for representing, creating, modifying and modeling a query statement for use in retrieving data from a database. Embodiments include an interactive graphical user interface for

inputting, creating, and modifying database query statements, as well as an application interface for enabling receipt and manipulation of existing query statements. In one embodiment, a modeling schema is defined for storing the query statement elements and for providing a high granularity, meaningful representation of complex query elements reflective of the query syntax. The modeling schema also reflects multiple dialects of the query language by representing element types and subtypes from all dialects considered in creating the schema. The granularity of the modeling schema enables reconstruction of the query statement or any element thereof with a single call to a node representative of that element. The call returns elements represented by the node and subnodes. The query model comprises atomic, hierarchical representations of all desired query elements, taking into account the various dialects of the query language, so that any incoming query statement can be stored within its schema. In one embodiment, a layer comprising a common set of generalized classes is provided between the user interface and the query model for use in retrieving data from the query model and populating user interfaces of different formats. Hand does not teach or suggest these features, as discussed below.

However, Hand does not teach or suggest “passing the translated objects from the first content viewer to a second content viewer, the second content viewer being in communication with the first content viewer and an a GUI application written to run on a specific GUI API of the plurality of GUI APIs, wherein the first and second content viewers interface with the model content provider within a GUI-model infrastructure, wherein the first and second content viewers are defined by a hierarchical set of classes, wherein the first content viewer is a higher level, non-GUI specific structure that is created without regard to which GUI API will be used, wherein the second content

viewer is a lower level GUI-specific structure that is created specifically to the GUI API with which it communicates,” as recited in independent claim 16.

The Examiner referred to elements 6a and 6b as being the same as the first content viewer. However, elements 6a and 6b are not “content viewers.” Instead, elements 6a and 6b are “devices.” Furthermore, nowhere does Hand specifically teach or suggest that elements 6a and 6b “interface with the model content provider” within a GUI-model infrastructure. In fact, elements 6a and 6b being devices (i.e., hardware) teaches away from elements 6a and 6b being content viewers “within a GUI-model infrastructure.”

The Examiner referred to elements 12a and 12b as being the same as the second content viewer. However, elements 12a and 12b are also not “content viewers.” Instead, elements 12a and 12b are “device specific modules” that provide methods to “access data from the devices 6a and 6b.” Elements 12a and 12b being “device specific” is not the same as being “GUI API specific.” Nowhere does Hand specifically describe elements 12a and 12b as being GUI API specific. Even if elements 12a and 12b utilize device specific APIs, elements 12a and 12b are not specifically described as being specific to any particular GUI API. In other words, while Hand mentions “device specific APIs,” Hand does not specifically describe “GUI-specific APIs.”

Furthermore, Hand does not teach or suggest that the first and second content viewers are “defined by a hierarchical set of classes,” where the first content viewer is a “higher level, non-GUI specific structure” and where the second content viewer is a “lower level GUI-specific structure,” as recited in independent claim 16. Elements 6a, 6b, 12a, and 12b cannot be defined in the same hierarchical set of classes, because, as

described above, elements 6a and 6b are hardware devices and elements 12a and 12b are device software modules (described as being implemented by code in column 5, lines 8-13, of Hand).

Therefore, Hand does not teach or suggest the combination of steps as recited in independent claim 16, and this claim is thus allowable over Goldberg.

Dependent claims 17-21

Dependent claims 17-21 depend from independent claim 16. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to independent claim 16 apply with equal force to claims 17-21, which are thus allowable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Examiner Stated:

Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hand et al. (U.S. Patent 7,032,071) as applied to claims 16-20 above and further in view of Bogrett (U.S. Patent 6,581,054)...

Dependent claims 29-30 depend from claim 19. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to claim 19 apply with equal force to claims 29-30, which are thus allowable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as claim 19.

Furthermore, claim 30 recites that the “first content viewer comprises wrapper code for a particular API, and wherein a new GUI application using a different GUI API is enabled to write its own wrapper code and reuse the second content viewer, which is non-GUI specific.” These features are not described or suggested in the cited references. Accordingly, claim 30 is allowable for at least these reasons.

New independent claims 31 and 32

New independent claims 31 and 32 are similar in scope to amended independent claim 16. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to amended independent claim 16 apply with equal force to claims 31 and 32. Therefore, claims 31 and 32 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

March 23, 2009

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Reg. No. 30,801

Customer Number 45728

(650) 493-4540 telephone
(650) 493-4549 fax